REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8 and 11-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. The amendments introduce no new matter, but rather are made to clarify the subject matter recited in the claims. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In reply to the February 23 Office Action, Applicants filed a Request for Reconsideration After Final Rejection ("Request") on June 19, 2007. Applicants' representative also requested, and was granted, a personal interview with Examiner Tamai on June 26, 2007. Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Tamai during the June 16 personal interview. Applicants' separate summary of the substance of the personal interview is incorporated into the remarks below. In reply to the June 19 Request, and in consideration of the arguments presented by Applicants' representative during the June 26 personal interview, Examiner Tamai mailed an Advisory Action on June 28, 2007.

The Office Action, on page 2, rejects claims 1, 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,448,700 to Seidner. The Office Action, on pages 3-5, varyingly rejects claims 5-8 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidner in view of one or more of U.S. Patent No. 5,770,899 to Hayashi and/or U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/00145353 to Kimura et al. (hereinafter "Kimura "). These rejections are again respectfully traversed.

With specific reference to Fig. 1 of Seidner, the Advisory Action indicates that the laminations of the stator 13 are considered to be in contact with the tube 3. As such, the Advisory Action alleges that features recited in at least independent claim 1 regarding how the cooling passages are implemented are taught by the reference.

Without conceding the propriety of the above analysis, and based on discussion in this regard undertaken during the June 26 personal interview, independent claim 1 is amended to clarify the subject matter recited in that claim. The amendments to claim 1 are supported by Figs. 2A-2C in Applicants' disclosure, as originally filed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, a stator core having a plurality of slots disposed in a direction of said rotation shaft in a manner with an opening facing a peripheral surface of said rotor; a stator coil wound substantially completely within said plurality of slots; a cooling passage formed in each of said plurality of slots such that said stator coil comes in contact with a cooling liquid, said cooling passage in each slot being implemented by covering the opening in each slot facing the peripheral surface of the rotor with a separate sealing member for each slot.

Focusing on Fig. 1, and specifically elements number 13, of Seidner, the Office Action continues to allege that Seidner can reasonably be considered to teach a stator core having a plurality of slots with all of the features positively recited in independent claim 1.

Seidner, at col. 2, lines 98-112, describes element 3, and its structural relationships, by stating "the usual side shields 1 and 2 of the stationary member, one on each side of the machine, are connected to a tube tightly fastened on the inner periphery of said shields and passing through the air gap between rotor and stator." The reference goes on to state "[a] second tube 4 within the former [tube 3] is fitted as a mantel over the rotor, forming with disks 7 and 8 fitting over the shaft parts 5 and 6, a liquid type enclosure for the whole rotor." The reference then concludes "[i]n this way, the rotating as well as the stationary member each are formed as an individual tightly closed casing which is filled the liquid cooling medium" (emphasis added).

In this manner, Seidner forms a tube in a tube. This tube-in-tube configuration of Seidner cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, covering the opening in each slot facing the peripheral surface of the rotor with a separate sealing member for each slot.

The tube 3 is not a "sealing member" as recited in the pending claims and moreover is not a separate sealing member for each slot.

For at least the above reasons, Seidner cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combination of all of the features positively recited in independent claim 1. Further, claims 3 and 4 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by Seidner for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Finally, because neither of Hayashi or Kimura is applied in a manner that can reasonably be considered to overcome the above-identified shortfalls in the application of Seidner to the subject matter of the pending claims, any permissible combination of these references with Seidner cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features positively recited in claims 5-8 and 11-14 for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly or indirectly on an allowable independent claim 1, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3-8 and 11-14 as being anticipated by Seidner, or unpatentable over Seidner in combination with the other applied references, are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-8 and 11-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54,734

Attachments:
Petition for Extension of Time
Request for Continued Examination

JAO:DAT/cfr

Date: July 11, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461